

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 8, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1, 14, 19 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 12, 13, 17, 18, 22 and 23 have been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 2-11, 15, 16, 20, 21, 25 and 26 remain pending in this application.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the claim for priority and safe receipt of the foreign priority document.

35 USC § 112

Claim 8 was rejected as being indefinite with regards to what kind of memory was being referred to as being of relatively faster accessibility. In response, claim 8 has been amended to remove the language "of relatively faster accessibility."

35 USC § 103

Claims 1-8, 10-11, 14-16 and 19-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slayden et al. (US Patent No. 5,652,901 - hereafter "Slayden") in view of Cullen et al. (US Patent No. 5,732,230 - hereafter "Cullen"). Additionally, claim 9 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slayden in view of Cullen and further in view of Sakamoto (US Patent No. 5,260,555 -

hereafter "Sakamoto"). Also, claims 24-26 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slayden in view of Cullen and further in view of Kurachi (US Patent No. 6,181,436 - hereafter "Kurachi"). These rejections are traversed as follows.

Discussion of Invention

The present invention teaches a method, apparatus and program for displaying preview images to print that are output on a display screen. A composite view of multiple pages and a page view of one the pages are output in bounded areas as preview images. The preview images are displayed in parallel on a preview display screen in a non-overlapped manner. Additionally, an enlarged view of a selected spot on the displayed page to print may also be displayed in parallel within a bounded area as a third non-overlapped preview image.

Combination of Slayden and Cullen Does Not Teach or Suggest the Invention

Independent claims 2, 3, 15-16 and 20-21 were rejected under the combination of Slayden in view of Cullen, and independent claims 25-26 were rejected under the combination of Slayden in view of Cullen, and further in view of Kurachi.

Slayden teaches a technique of printing multiple separated print images which together form a large print image which could not be printed on a single sheet of print paper. Slayden discloses displaying each separate print view for each sheet individually. Slayden further discloses displaying a plurality of print views on a screen. However Slayden only discloses a technique of displaying those separate print views

in the same magnitude of resolution, and does not teach the present invention, such as displaying a composite view and a page view side-by-side on the same screen.

Cullen discloses a technique of composing separately-scanned image fragments into an oversized image which is too large to be scanned. Cullen also discloses a technique of zooming in on a portion of the main image by delineating a region for zooming (column 9, lines 11-28). After activating the zoom function, the user is presented with a display similar to FIG. 8 of Cullen, in which a zoom window overlaps the main image, obscuring a portion thereof.

The Office Action asserts that by combining the teachings of these two references, one skilled in the art could arrive at the present invention. However, the present invention, as set forth in the amended independent claims, is directed to displaying a plurality of print images which are in different magnitudes and which are displayed in bounded areas without overlapping each other in a preview display screen. Thus, under the invention, the preview print images can be understood very easily by a user before printing a large print image which is to be printed on multiple sheets of print paper, in which each sheet comprises a small section of the overall image. The combination of Slayden and Cullen does not teach or suggest this. Rather, Cullen merely teaches zooming in on a portion of an image, and at best teaches displaying a zoomed portion that overlaps and obscures the primary image, while Slayden merely teaches displaying multiple images of the same resolution on a single screen. Neither Slayden nor Cullen teach displaying two or three separate images, namely a composite view, a page view, and a spot view, in bounded non-overlapping

areas in parallel on a single display screen. Accordingly, the combination of Slayden and Cullen cannot be fairly said to teach or suggest the present invention, as set forth in independent claims 2, 3, 15, 16, 20 and 21.

Further with respect to claims 25 and 26, Kurachi teaches that a rough image data is produced and displayed on the print job display device together with print job management information (column 9, line 61, through column 10, line 27). Thus, the combination of Kurachi with Slayden and Cullen fails to teach the invention recited in claims 25 and 26, since, as stated above, none of these references teach or suggest displaying two or three separate images of different magnitude, such as a composite view, a page view, and a spot view, in bounded areas on a single display screen in a non-overlapped fashion. Accordingly, independent claims 25 and 26 are also patentable over these references and the other art of record, whether taken singly, or in combination.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims, claim additional features of the invention, and are patentable at least because they depend from allowable base claims.

Appl. No. 09/922,657
Amendment
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2005

Docket No. YOK-100

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



Colin D. Barnitz
Registration No. 35,061

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: November 9, 2005